

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 3, 2007. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 55-59 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1 and 56 are in independent form. Claims 1, 4, 56 and 58 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

An Information Disclosure Statement is being filed concurrently herewith.

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 55-59 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Office Action states that the limitation in Claims 1, 2, 4 and 55 of "said data transfer unit transfers the plurality of first image data packet and the plurality of second image data packets to one of said plural image processing units based on an identification information for identifying one of said plural image processing units added to the second image data packets, and one of said plural image processing units performs image processing on the first image data packets and the second image data packets which are transferred by the data transfer units based in the identification information" working with other claimed limitations as a whole, are subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time of application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicants have carefully reviewed and amended independent Claim 1 with special attention to the points raised in the Office Action. Applicants believe that the following amended recitation is fully supported by at least the following identified paragraphs in the specification: "said data transfer unit transfers the first image data packet to said second image

processing unit in a case where an identification information for identifying said second image processing unit is added to the first image data packet [see at least page 47, line 27 through page 49, line 13], transfers the first image data packet to said third image processing unit in a case where the identification information for identifying said third image processing unit is added to the first image data packet [see at least page 35, lines 12-26], and transfers the second image data packet to the third image processing unit in a case where the identification information for identifying said third image processing unit is added to the second image data packet [see at least page 48, line 26 through page 49, line 13; page 51, lines 11-25]”.

Applicants believe that the rejections of Claim 1, and dependent Claims 2, 4 and 55 under Section 112, first paragraph, have been obviated and respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Regarding Claims 56-59, the Office Actions states that the limitation of "said data transfer unit transfers the plurality of first image data packet and the plurality of second image data packets to one of said plural image processing units based on an identification information for identifying one of said plural image processing units added to the second image data packets, and one of said plural image processing units performs image processing on the first image data packets and the second image data packets which are transferred by the data transfer units based in the identification information" working with other claimed limitations as a whole, are subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicants have carefully reviewed and amended independent Claim 56 in the

same manner as set forth above with respect to Claim 1. Applicants submit that amended Claim 56, and dependent Claims 57-59, fully conform to the requirements of Section 112, first paragraph, for the same reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 55-59 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The claims have been carefully reviewed and amended as deemed necessary to ensure that they conform fully to the requirements of Section 112, second paragraph, with special attention to the points raised in paragraph 4 of the Office Action. It is believed that the rejection under Section 112, second paragraph, has been obviated, and its withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request early and favorable continued examination on the merits.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jennifer A. Reda/
Jennifer A. Reda
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 57,840

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 627765v1